

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

10/031,998

Applicant(s)

BIRCHENALL, ANDREW
KELSEY

Examiner

José A Fortuna

Art Unit

1731

All Participants:(1) José A Fortuna.(2) Barbara C. Siegel.**Status of Application:** _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 22 September 2003**Time:** _____**Type of Interview:**☒ Telephonic☐ Video Conference☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

9 and 10

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet***Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)_____
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner called applicants attorney to propose and amendment in order to put the application in condition for allowance. Specifically the examiner pointed out the antecedent basis problem of claim 9. The examiner also indicated that in claim 5, the phrase "or textile" was not deleted in the second line, (it was deleted in the first line), so it did not have antecedent basis. Mrs. Siegell agreed with proposed changes as shown in the examiner's amendment.